

**U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION V**

*Working
Copy*

DATE: September 10, 2003

FROM: Michael Chrystof

TO: Karen Mason-Smith, Ft. Dearborn RPM

**SUBJECT: US-EPA Comments on Data Validation Report (dated August, 2003) for
Construction Completion Report for Various Site Remediations, Ft.
Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.**

EPA Region 5 Records Ctr.



374734

Please find attached US-EPA Comments.

Attachment

**US-EPA COMMENTS ON DATA VALIDATION REPORT (AUG. 2003) FOR
CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION REPORT**

**FOR VARIOUS SITE REMEDIATIONS
FT. DEARBORN, IL**

COMMENTS:

Data Validation Report Main Body:

1. **Section 4.7 Data Review Comments/Surrogate Recovery Limits Sub-Sections:** There is a minor typo in several of these sub-sections, stating that "The total number of samples analyzed was twenty-seventy". Please correct.

Attachment 2 - Checklists:

2. **PCB Checklists:** For all PCB checklists, there is an "N/A" (not applicable) notification for Item 4d (pertains to Retention Time Window specs).. Looking back at the Sample Analysis Subsection for PCBs (see p.25), text notes that the RRT were within control limits. Please explain.
3. **Glycol Checklists:** For the Glycol checklists, there is an "N/A" (not applicable) notification for Item 4d (pertains to Retention Time Window specs).. Looking back at the Sample Analysis Subsection for Glycol (see p.26), text notes that the RRT were within control limits. Please explain.

Attachment 5 - Chain of Custodies:

4. **Cooler Receipt Report/ADRL #301101/Cooler #N011:** Report indicates that there was no Custody Seal date or name, and states "No" to Item 5: "Were custody papers sealed in a plastic bag, and taped inside to the lid?". If this is a typo, please correct. If not, this practice should be revised for future sampling efforts so that the seals are dated and named, and that the C.O.C. form is included in the cooler as required by Item 5.
5. **Cooler Receipt Report/ADRL #301103/Cooler #N004:** Report indicates that there was only one custody seal on the cooler. Aren't two seals normally utilized? Please explain. It would also be helpful if the signature/name on the seal(s) was more legible to the sample custodian, as several sample receipt forms noted that the seal name could not be read.

Attachment 6 - Data Qualifiers:

6. **Semivolatile Tables:** It was noted that the values reported out as "U" were slightly higher than the RL list in the QAPP. There is not an indication in the tables here, but did these samples require an adjustment that thereby raised the reporting limit?

**U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION V**

DATE: September 10, 2003
FROM: Michael Chrystof
TO: Karen Mason-Smith, Ft. Dearborn RPM
SUBJECT: **US-EPA Comments on Data Validation Report (dated August, 2003) for Construction Completion Report for Various Site Remediations, Ft. Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.**

Please find attached US-EPA Comments.

Attachment

**US-EPA COMMENTS ON DATA VALIDATION REPORT (AUG. 2003) FOR
CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION REPORT
FOR VARIOUS SITE REMEDIATIONS
FT. DEARBORN, IL**

COMMENTS:

Data Validation Report Main Body:

1. **Section 4.7 Data Review Comments/Surrogate Recovery Limits Sub-Sections:** There is a minor typo in several of these sub-sections, stating that "The total number of samples analyzed was twenty-seventy". Please correct.

Attachment 2 - Checklists:

2. **PCB Checklists:** For all PCB checklists, there is an "N/A" (not applicable) notification for Item 4d (pertains to Retention Time Window specs).. Looking back at the Sample Analysis Subsection for PCBs (see p.25), text notes that the RRT were within control limits. Please explain.
3. **Glycol Checklists:** For the Glycol checklists, there is an "N/A" (not applicable) notification for Item 4d (pertains to Retention Time Window specs).. Looking back at the Sample Analysis Subsection for Glycol (see p.26), text notes that the RRT were within control limits. Please explain.

Attachment 5 - Chain of Custodies:

4. **Cooler Receipt Report/ADRL #301101/Cooler #N011:** Report indicates that there was no Custody Seal date or name, and states "No" to Item 5: "Were custody papers sealed in a plastic bag, and taped inside to the lid?". If this is a typo, please correct. If not, this practice should be revised for future sampling efforts so that the seals are dated and named, and that the C.O.C. form is included in the cooler as required by Item 5.
5. **Cooler Receipt Report/ADRL #301103/Cooler #N004:** Report indicates that there was only one custody seal on the cooler. Aren't two seals normally utilized? Please explain. It would also be helpful if the signature/name on the seal(s) was more legible to the sample custodian, as several sample receipt forms noted that the seal name could not be read.

Attachment 6 - Data Qualifiers:

- 6. Semivolatile Tables:** It was noted that the values reported out as “U” were slightly higher than the RL list in the QAPP. There is not an indication in the tables here, but did these samples require an adjustment that thereby raised the reporting limit?